

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_148759

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

297.1

T58U

Imam, M. Moh.
Dr. Karl Kumm's Attack on The
Holy Quran n. d.

13.3.11 IV 191

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY 2

Call No. 297.1/T382 Accession No. 9266

Author Tamm, M. M.

Title Dr. Karl Kumm's attack on the
Holy Queen

This book should be returned on or before the date
last marked below.

--	--	--	--

DR. KARL KUMM'S ATTACK ON THE HOLY QURAN

BY

M. MOHAMMAD TIMUR.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED

BY

The Mohammadan Tract and Book Depot, Punjab.

Lahore :

PRINTED AT THE PUNJAB STEAM PRESS.

ing as soon as their opponents discontinued their hostilities towards them. Thirdly, they show that if the opponents desisted from fighting, their past transgressions were to be pardoned, for, says God, 'if they desist, God is Gracious and Merciful,' i.e., their past cruelties must be forgiven them. Thus it is clear that the object of the Muslim war was only to restrain the hand of the oppressor. When the battle of Badr was fought, the revelation of God descended on the Holy Prophet saying "O Meccans, if ye desired a decision, now hath the decision come to you. It will be better for you if you desist (from fighting). But if you return to it we will return : and your forces, though they be many, shall by no means avail you aught because God is with the faithful" (viii. 19). These verses clearly establish the fact that even after the war had commenced, the opponents of Islam were asked to desist from fighting and they were also told that as God was with the faithful, He would make them victorious over their powerful rivals, if the latter persisted in their campaign against Islam. Such a prophecy could only be uttered by God. It was uttered at a time when the Muslims were totally weak and were hardly able to hold their own against their numerous enemies. And the fulfilment of this prophecy showed that it had really emanated from God.

The fact that the Muslims were commanded to fight only as long as their enemies continued to fight with them, and that the enemy was repeatedly warned to desist from fighting clearly shows that the conclusion at which Dr. Kumm has arrived is utterly erroneous. Another verse which, of the verses already quoted, deserves particular mention is "Fight, therefore, against them, until there be no temptation to idolatry and the religion be God's." The word which Sale translates, as 'temptation to idolatry' is *fitnah*, which originally means "causing one to fall into trial, affliction, distress or hardship" (vide Lane Poole's Arabic English Lexicon). The command of God to fight with the unbelievers until there be no *fitnah*, i.e. until the unbelievers abstained from inflicting distress and affliction upon the believers in order to compel them to relinquish Islam] shows that the object of the unbelievers in waging war against the Muslims was no other than to pervert them from their faith by reducing them to straits. The Muslims were commanded to fight with their oppressors to deliver themselves from their hands and they were bidden to cease fighting as soon as their enemies refrained from oppressing them for the sake of religion. Before the Muslims took up their arms to defend themselves from their foes, there was no peace for them in the land. There were many that were believers at heart, but such was the tyranny of the enemies of Islam that they could not openly confess their faith in the Holy Prophet. They followed the religion of the idolators out of fear. Thus their religion was not for God but

for those whom they feared. The Muslims were commanded to fight until there was no persecution for religion and every body was at liberty to follow the religion which he believed to be true. When the enemy was engaged in bitter persecution of the faithful unchecked, there were many who stuck to the religion of their forefathers morely through fear of the persecutors and thus their religion was not for God, but for those whose fear had prevented them from abandoning their old faith. And the Muslims were bidden to fight until the persecution should cease to exist and every body's religion be purely for God. This is the interpretation of the verse which Sale translates as "Fight, therefore, against them, until there be no temptation to idolatry and the religion be God's (or more correctly, *for God*, the original word being *Lillah* which literally means 'for God'). A very erroneous interpretation has been put by the Christian writers on the words 'until the religion be for God.' They have been made to signify 'until all men embrace Islam.' It is said that according to this verse the Muslims are commanded to fight until the whole world becomes Muslim. The absurdity of this interpretation can be shown in many ways, but here I will confine myself to the verses already quoted. That the interpretation put upon the verse by certain Christians is erroneous is apparent from the context. The words immediately preceding the verse in question, to follow the rendering of Sale, are:—"Fight, therefore, against them, until there be no temptation to idolatry." Now these words have already been explained and they signify that war against the unbelievers is to be continued until the enemies of Islam cease persecuting the Muslims. Thus war to end with the end of the persecution. it was not to be continued until all unbelievers had ceased to exist. When the unbelievers abstained from inflicting tortures on the faithful and from fighting them in order to turn them away from Islam, the command for the Muslims was, 'Stop fighting.' Such being the command immediately preceding the verse in question is it not utterly unreasonable to say that the very next verse, which is in fact a part of the preceding verse, contains a command to continue fighting even after the oppression had ended and to go on warring until all unbelievers had either embraced Islam or been put to the sword? Let us now turn to the verse immediately following the verse in question. It runs thus:—"But if they desist, then let there be no hostility" Does not this verse falsify the idea that the Holy Quran commands the faithful to go on fighting until all unbelievers are brought into the fold of Islam? If such had been the command of God, He would not have bidden the Muslims to abstain from fighting as soon as their opponents discontinued their hostilities towards them. The next verse is "Except against the ungodly," which Rodwell renders as "save against the wrong-doers." The word in the original for the 'wrong-doers' or the

ungodly is *Zalimin* which means 'tyrants, oppressors' (*vide* Arabic-English Dictionary by Steingass). Thus it was only against the tyrants and the oppressors that war was allowed.

There is yet another teaching embodied in the verses quoted from page 20 of Sale's Translation which deserves particular notice. Not only do they permit fighting only against the aggressors they enjoin strict justice. The aggressors are to be punished, but the punishment is to be proportionate to their aggression. Among the said verses, the reader will find the following directions :—

(a) "Fight in the way of God against those that fight against you but transgress not, for God loveth not the transgressors." Sale introduces the words *by attacking them first* after 'transgress not' by way of explanation, but his explanation only limits the sense of the verse. The verse prohibits the Muslims not only from attacking the enemy first, but also from being guilty of any transgression even after the war has commenced. They are permitted to fight those who fight against them, but in fighting they are not allowed to transgress, i.e., to inflict on the enemy an injury greater than the injury inflicted by the enemy. An illustration will make it clear. When at the field of Ohud, the Holy Prophet saw the mutilated body of his beloved and brave uncle, Hamza, the sight tore his heart, and addressing the body of his uncle, he said, "I will cause seventy of them to be mutilated in place of you." Thereupon God sent His word, saying, "If ye punish, punish only as ye were punished., but if ye are patient, it is best for those who are patient." (xxi, 127).

(b) The verses quoted from page 20 of Sale's translation contain further directions as to how the Muslims were to observe equity even during the war. "And turn them out of that whereof they have dispossessed you." Rodwell renders the verse as "And eject them from whatever place they have ejected you." These words not only indicate that the initiative lay on the side of the enemy, but that the Muslims were allowed to retaliate, only in proportion to the wrong done to them and were not permitted to exceed the proper limit. They could eject them from the place from which the enemy had ejected them, but could not turn them out of the place of which they had not been dispossessed. Is not this teaching of the Holy Quran just and reasonable? Still Dr. Kumm accuses the Holy Quran of giving teachings which are calculated to engender fanaticism! Perhaps he means that the unbelievers should have been at liberty to attack the Muslims, and even to expel them from their country, but the Muslims should not have been allowed even to repel their attack or to drive them out of the land of which they had dispossessed them, and that if they were allowed to do so, they should be called fanatics. If this is fanaticism, then indeed we are ready to admit that the Holy Quran engenders fanaticism.

Dr. Kumm may see a teaching claculated to engender fanaticism in the words already quoted, "And kill them wherever ye find them." It is a habit with the Christians to select such verses as the above and then having severed them from the context, to hold them up before ignorant or ill-informed men as verses inculcating indiscriminate slaughter of all unbelievers, no matter who they are and where they are to be found. It is the most grievous dishonesty to represent the Pronouns or Nouns in such verses as referring or applying to all unbelievers, no matter of what country they are and to what age they belong. Take the verse quoted above. If the Pronoun *them* in the said verse refer to all non-Muslims, then indeed it cannot be denied that the verse commands the faithful to roam about in the land with drawn swords and to kill every non-Muslim that may come in their way. But if Dr. Kumm possesses some sense of justice coupled with a little amonnt of intelligence, a reference to the verse immediately preceding the verse in question will make it clear to him that the pronoun *them* in the said verse refers to men 'who fight against,' the Muslims, and a reference to the verse immediately following the verse in question will convince him that the persons to whom the verse refers are men who ejected the Muslims from their possessions. It should also be borne in mind that the Holy Companions of the Holy Prophet were commanded to kill their enemies wherever they found them because their enemies also killed the faithful wherever they found them. In proof of this, I refer Dr. Kumm to the history of the times. He should also take into consideration the fact that the people with whom the Holy Prophet had to deal were not civilized men like Dr. Kumm. They were wild and lawless children of the desert who seldom fought in regular battle array and whom nothig but constant hard fighting could check from their depredations. Still the Muslims were prohibited from fighting them within the sacred territory and during the sacred months unless they were first to violate their sanctity by attacking the Muslims within the sacred limits or in the sacred months.

(c) Among the verses quoted from page 20 of Sale's translation, there is yet another verse which enjoins upon the Muslims the observance of strict justice and equity in their dealings with their enemies even in the time of war. It says, "And whoever transgresseth against you, do ye transgress against him *in like manner as he hath transgressed against you* and fear God, and know that God is with those that fear Him." This verse also, like the foregoing verses, permits the Muslims to inflict upon the enemy an injury similar to the injury inflicted by the enemy, warns them against a violation of this condition and points out that God will help them only if they observe this condition. Still Dr. Kumm informs Reuter's Agency that these verses of the Holy Quran engender fanaticism !

One more verse and I shall have done with page 20 of Sale's translation. The last verse on that page runs thus :—"Contribute *out of your substance* towards the defence of the religion of God and throw not *yourselves* with your own hands into perdition ; and do good, for God loveth those who do good." The words "Throw not *yourselves* with your own hands into perdition," have been explained as meaning "Be not accessory to your own destruction by neglecting contributions to war." This interpretation is supported both by Rodwell and Sale. Thus, this verse bears further testimony to the fact that the enemies of Islam were bent on the destruction of the faithful and that if the latter had not made sufficient preparations to repel the attacks of the enemy, they would have been totally destroyed.

Thus we see that the verses on page 20 of Sale's Translation which have been represented by Dr. Kumm as engendering fanaticism and inculcating indiscriminate slaughter or enslavement of unbelievers of all lands and all times, lead to the following conclusions :—

1. The Holy Companions were permitted to fight only those that fought against them.

2. They were strictly prohibited from attacking the unbelievers first.

3. Even during the war, they were ordered to observe strict equity and were warned against all sorts of transgression.

4. They were ordered to cease fighting as soon as their enemies desisted from oppression.

5. The object of the war of the unbelievers against the Muslims was to destroy them or to force them to abandon Islam.

6. If the faithful had neglected to take any step for their protection against their enemies, they might be said to have been accessory to their own destruction.

7. The object of the Muslims war was only self-protection and the restoration of peace.

Now I ask Dr. Kumm to point out the verses on page 20 which inculcated aggressive war against all unbelievers. The verses originally referred to the unbelievers of Arabia who had been guilty of aggression.

I now pass from page 20 to page 22 of Sale's Translation which is the next page to which Dr. Karl Kumm refers in his message to Reuter's Agency. The verses on page 22 dealing with fighting, run as follows, in the words of Sale :

"War is enjoined on you *against the infidels* : but this is hateful unto you : yet perchance ye hate a thing which is better for you, and perchance ye love a thing which is worse for you : but God knoweth and ye know not. They will ask thee concerning the sacred month, *whether they may war therein* : Answer, To war

therein is grievous ; but to obstruct the way of God, and infidelity towards Him, and to keep men from the holy temple, and to drive out His people from thence, is more grievous in the sight of God, and the temptation to *idolatry* is more grievous than to kill in the *sacred months*. They will not cease to war against you, until they turn you from your religion, if they are able."

I fail to see here also any ground for Dr. Kumm's allegation that the essence of the Quranic teachings is, 'Fight the infidel, and enslave him or bring him low.' Indeed one of the verses says : "War is enjoined upon you," but it is not against all unbelievers that war is enjoined. If Dr. Kumm had really made an intelligent study of these verses, he would have seen that if these verses enjoined war against the unbelievers, they also gave reasons for doing so. The verses which follow name many acts of the unbelievers against whom the faithful were required to fight, and every one who will consider those acts of the unbelievers will have no hesitation in admitting that under the circumstances, taking recourse to arms was the only course left open to the Muslims.

Firstly, the unbelievers obstructed the way of God, *i.e.*, they hindered men from accepting Islam.

Secondly, they kept men from the Holy Temple. All men were free to visit the Holy Mosque at Mecca. The Quresh could not prevent even their enemies from visiting the Holy Place. Even if war was raging, it ceased during the pilgrimage season, and hostile parties performed their pilgrimage without molesting each other. But such was the hostility of the Quresh and their allies towards Islam that a privilege that was allowed to every other foe was refused to the Muslims.

Thirdly, the enemy not only prevented the Muslims from visiting the Holy Mosque, but they had even driven out the Muslim residents of the Holy Mosque from their homes.

Fourthly, there was *Mitnah* which Salo translates as 'temptation to idolatry,' but which really means 'causing one to fall into trial, affliction, distress or hardship which shows that the converts to Islam were caused to fall into trial, affliction, distress and hardship, so that they might be compelled to abandon the new faith.

Fifthly, there was the determination on the part of the unbelievers to continue fighting the Muslims until the latter abandoned Islam. "They will not cease to war against you" says the Holy Qur'an, "until they turn you from your religion, if they are able." Mark the tyranny of the enemies of Islam. When the Muslims lived at Mecca, they subjected them to painful tortures in order to turn them away from Islam, and when their pitiless persecution forced them to fly from their city and seek refuge in a distant town they pursued them even there and were determined to go on fighting against the faithful until they turned them from

their faith, if they were able. When such was the hostility of the enemy, how was it possible for them to live unless they resorted to arms for self-defence. I wish Dr. Kumm and his friends had made an intelligent study of the Holy Quran and then it would have become clear to them that it was the enemy that forced the Muslims to fly to arms for self-protection.

It is often alleged by the Christians, that the Muslims bore persecution as long as they were weak, but as soon as they became strong enough, they began to war against the enemy. The verses on page 22 of Sale's translation refute this objection also. The first verse says :—" War is enjoined you *against the unbelievers*, but this is hateful to you." This shows that when the command to fight was given to the Muslims, they did not like to fight because of their extreme weakness compared with the strength of their powerful foe. The war was hateful to them because their enemy was very strong and war with him appeared to them to be certain ruin. Speaking of the Battle of Badr, God says :—" And God had already succoured you at Badr while you were in a poor way." (iii, 119). How weak the Muslims were at the time of the battle of Badr, which was the first battle fought between the faithful and the unbelievers, will become apparent from the following two verses which refer to the said battle :—

(1). "*Remember* how the Lord caused thee to go forth from thy home with truth, and verily a part of the believers were quite averse to it : they disputed with thee about the truth after it had been made clear, as if they were being led forth to death and saw it *before them*." (viii, 5, 6).

From this it appears that when the Muslims were called upon to meet the advancing army of Mecca, they were so weak that many of them were averse to fighting and it appeared to them as if they were being led forth to death and saw death before them.

(2) —When the armies came face to face at Badr, the weakness of the Muslims made them cry to their Lord for assistance. "When you sought succour of your Lord and He answered you, 'I will aid you with a thousand angels, rank on rank' (viii, 9). If the reader desires to know the weak condition of the Muslims at the commencement of the war, let him mark the following verse : "And remember when you were few and reputed weak in the land, that ye feared lest men should pluck you away ; then was it that He took you in and strengthened you with His help, and supplied you with good things ; haply ye will give thanks." (viii, 26).

The next page of Sale's translation to which Dr. Kumm refers is 64. The verses dealing with war on this page are as follows :—

"They (the *Munafikin* or hypocrites spoken of in the previous verses) desire that ye should become infidels, as they are infidels and that ye should be alike. Therefore take not friends from

among them until they fly *their country* for the religion of God ; and if they turn back, take, them and kill them wherever ye find them ; and take no friend from among them, nor any helper." Perhaps Dr. Kumm finds fault with those verses and it is probably these which appear to him to inculcate the slaughter or enslavement of all infidels, but if he had taken the trouble of reading the very next verses. it would have become clear to him who the people were against whom the Holy Quran bade the Muslims to fight. For the verses which immediately follow the foregoing verses say :—

" Except those who go unto a people who are in alliance with you, or those who come unto you, their hearts forbidding them either to fight against you, or to fight against their own people. And if God pleased, he would have permitted them to have prevailed against you, and they would have fought against you. But if they depart from you, and fight not against you, and offer you peace God does not allow you *to take or kill* them." Now the reader is requested to note carefully the exceptions contained in the above verses. There were certain men who pretended to be Muslims, but were infidels at heart. They were in fact secret enemies of Islam and were even more dangerous than those who openly fought against the faithful. God warned the Holy Prophet against them. They were not to be taken as friends or helpers, and this warning was given as a safeguard against their treachery. God also gives a test to prove the sincerity of their professions. If they quitted the company of the enemies of Islam and joined the Muslims at Medina, they were to be treated as Muslims, but if they continued to live among the opponents of Islam, they were to be treated as enemies, except in the following cases :—

(a). If they joined such unbelievers as had concluded a treaty of peace with the Muslims.

(b). If they did not join the enemies of Islam in their wars against the faithful.

(c). If they departed from the Muslims and made not war against them and offered them peace.

Far from enjoining the Muslims to war against such men, God exhorts them to be thankful that they kept aloof from war. From this it also appears plainly that if the Holy Companions fought against the unbelievers, it was because the latter fought against them, and that if the unbelievers had not waged war against them, they would have not only not warred against them, but also felt thankful for it. The Holy Quran also tells us plainly in what case the hypocrites were to be fought against. For the very next verse says :—" Ye shall find others who are desirous to enter into a confidence with you, and *at the same time* to preserve a confidence with their own people, so often as they return to sedition, they

shall be subverted therein ; and if they depart not from you, nor offer you peace nor restrain their hands *from warring against you*, then take them and kill them wheresoever ye find them ; over these We have granted you a manifest power." Was it not necessary for the Muslims to fight such men, in the time of war ? I ask Dr. Kumm to answer this question.

The remaining pages to which Dr. Karl Kumm refers in his message to Reuter's Agency are 70, 71, 72, 83 and 365. I have carefully perused these pages, and have not come across a single passage dealing with war, except one on page 82, where God, speaking of the Jews, says, " So often as they shall kindle a fire for war, God shall extinguish it, and they shall set their minds to act corruptly in the earth but God loveth not the corrupt doers." This verse refers to the intrigues of the Jews of Medina against the Muslims and their attempts to incite the idolatrous Arabs against them, and adds that God shall frustrate their wicked designs and foil their efforts. History tells us that the Jews of the days of the Holy Prophet did make such efforts which met with failure, but a reference to them is outside the scope of this article. It is apparent, however, that the verse does not contain any command for the Muslims to shed innocent blood. On the other hand it shows that it was the enemies of Islam that were always intriguing against the Muslims and seeking their destruction. I wonder why Dr. Kumm has, through Reuter's Agency, referred the public to the pages named above. There is one thing, however, which is common to all these pages and that is a refutation of the erroneous doctrines of Christianity and it is perhaps this circumstance which has led Dr. Kumm to refer to these pages of Sale's translation. Page 70 and 71 tell us that Jesus did not die on the cross and that the Christians do not possess any certain proof of the fact that Jesus actually expired on the cross and thus died a death which is held accursed both by the Jews and the Christians. It is also said " We have prepared for such of them as are unbelievers a painful punishment." On page 72 there are passages that are levelled against the Trinity. On page 82, it is said " They are surely unbelievers (Sale says, infidels) who say, Verily God is Christ the Son of Mary." On page 83, we have the following verses, to quote the translation of Sale ; " They are certainly infidels, who say, God is the third of three: for there is no God besides one God ; and if they refrain not from what they say, a painful torment shall surely be inflicted on such of them as are unbelievers." Again, " Christ the Son of Mary is no more than an apostle." On page 365, we have :—Jesus is no more than a servant whom we favoured." Again speaking of the Christians. the Holy Quran says, " Woe to those who have acted unjustly, because of the punishment of a grievous day."

It appears that the object of Dr. Kumm in referring to these pages is to show that the Christians are also spoken of as infidels in the Holy Quran and that therefore the verses which speak of war against the unbelievers apply to the Christians as well. They would have indeed applied to the Christians, if they had commanded the Muslims to war against all infidels, no matter who they were and where they were found. But I have already shown that war was not permitted against all unbelievers, that it was allowed only against such of them as were first to war against the faithful with the object of either destroying them or forcing them to recant their faith; so, if Dr. Kumm makes war against the Muslims in order to destroy them or to compel them to adopt Christianity, then the Muslims, according to the Holy Quran, are allowed to fight but if Dr. Kumm leave them alone, then they are forbidden by the Quran to make war against him, and if they do so, they will be guilty of transgression in the sight of God and will be punished by God for their wickedness.

It may also be pointed out that word which Sale translates as 'infidels' *kafir*, which means one who *denies* or who is *ungrateful*. In the Holy Quran it is applied to those who denied the claims of the Holy Prophet who refused to believe in God as represented by the Holy Quran. It was opposed to *Mumin*, which means a believer and therefore it did not mean more than an unbeliever or a non-Muslim. It is not used as a term of abuse, nor was it ever resented by the idolaters of Arabia, who knew that they were unbelievers. If Dr. Kumm resents this term when it is applied to the Christians by the Holy Quran, it is because he is ignorant of Arabic.

Now we have done with the pages which Dr. Kumm has named in his message, but he also speaking of 'others which he says, inculcate indiscriminate slaughter or enslavement of every unbeliever. Therefore it will not be out of place if we refer here to a few other passages of the Holy Quran, in order to show that other passages also contain teachings similar to those contained in the verses already quoted. Let us begin with the verse which first gave permission to the Muslims to take up arms against their enemies. The verse runs thus :—

"Permission is given to those who are fought against, because they are wronged—and verily, God to help them has the might,—who have been driven forth from their homes undeservedly, only for that they said, Our Lord is God." (xvi, 40). The verse is too plain to need any comment. If Dr. Kumm make an intelligent study of this verse, he will see that permission was given to the Muslims to fight, because they were fought against, and because they were driven forth from their homes undeservedly, only for that they said, 'Our Lord is God.'

The verse which comes immediately after above verse contains a teaching which the reader will in vain seek for in the scriptures of any other revealed religion. It is a teaching of the highest religious tolerance. The verse says : " And were it not for God's repelling some men with others, cloisters and synagogues and mosques wherein God's name is mentioned much would be destroyed. Can Dr. Kumm who accused the Holy Quran of engendering fanaticism produce a passage from the Bible comparable with the one just quoted ? The verse teaches that the prayer-houses of all religions should be respected, that there should be perfect freedom for all in the exercise of religious observances and that where that freedom does not exist, it should be bought even with blood. When a party of the Christians of Najran visited the Holy Prophet at Medina, he allowed them to use his own mosque as a Church where they performed their Sunday service. When Omar, the second successor of the Holy Prophet entered Jerusalem, he was requested to say his prayers in the Christian Cathedral, but he said, If I did so, the coming generations would turn it into a mosque ?

The reader is also requested to note the following injunctions which the Christian Missionary takes care to omit when he refers to the Quranic verses dealing with war :—

- (a), " There is no compulsion in religion " (ii. 257).
- (b), " But say, ' This is the truth from your Lord, so let him who will, believe and let him who will, disbelieve, ' " (xviii, 30),
- (c), " We know what they say about thee, (O Prophet) and thou art not over them 'o compell. ' " (1).
- (d), ' Will ye not do battle with a people who have broken their covenant and aimed to expel your apostle and attacked you first ? Will ye dread them ? God truly is more worthy of your fear, if ye are believers ' " (ix. 13" (ix, 13).
- (e), " But what hath come to you that ye fight not on the path of God and for the weak among men, women, and children, who say, ' O our Lord ! bring us forth from this city whose inhabitants are oppressors, give us a champion from thy presence ; and give us from thy presence a defender. ' " (iv, 77).
- (f), " Say to those who misbelieve, If they desist they will be forgiven what is past " (i. e., if the unbelievers desist fighting, the Muslims too will desist from fighting and the numberless wrongs that the unbelievers had perpetrated on the faithful will be forgiven them) " (viii, 39).
- (g), If they incline to peace, incline thou to it too, and rely upon God ; verily He both hears and knows. And if they deceive thee, then God is enough for thee, (viii, 63, 64). Thus the Holy Prophet was bidden to incline to peace, whenever the enemy offered him peace, and the thought that the enemy might only be deceiving him was not to deter him from concluding

a treaty of peace. From this it appears that the object of the Muslim wars was only to protect the faithful from oppression and to establish peace.

(h) "But if they break faith with you after their treaty and revile your religion, then do battle with the ringleaders of misbelief. verily, there is no faith in them; haply they may desist,"

(ix, 12). This also shows that the object of the Holy Prophet in fighting the ringleaders of the unbelievers was only that haply they might desist from fighting.

(i). "And if any of the idolators seek thy refuge, give him refuge that he may hear the Word of God, then let him reach his place of safety—that is because they are a folk who do not know." (ix, 6). But Dr. Kumm informs us through Reuter's Agency that the Quran enjoins its followers to kill or enslave every infidel that falls into their hands.

(j). "God forbids you not respecting those who have not fought against you for religion's sake and who have not driven you forth from your homes, that ye should act righteously and justly towards them; verily God loveth the just." (ix, 8).

I believe now it must have become clear to Dr. Kumm that the Holy Quran does not inculcate the slaughter or enslavement of infidals. God says He will love those Muslims who act righteously and justly towards the infidels, even if they be Christians. It is only when the unbelievers war against the Muslims that permission is given to the latter to fight. The Muslims are not bidden to fight the unbelievers for their being unbelievers. For just as they are bidden to fight the unbelievers when the latter attack them, similarly they are also commanded to do battle with Muslims when they attack other Muslims. When Dr. Kumm made an intelligent study of the Holy Quran, he must have come across the following verses:—

"Moreover, if two bodies of the faithful are at war, then make ye peace between them: and if one of them wrong the other, then against the part which doth the wrong, until it comes back to the precepts of God." (xlix, 9.)

Now, Dr. Kumm has no reason to complain, for if the Holy Quran enjoins war against the unbelievers if they attack war against the Muslims, it also enjoins war against the believers when they attack other Muslims. In both cases, the end is the same, viz., the protection of the weak against the tyranny of the strong.

"But what hath come to you." says the Holy Quran, "that ye fight not on the path of God and for the weak among men, women, and children, who say, 'O our Lord! bring us forth from this city whose inhabitants are oppressors, give us a champion from thy presence a defender.'" (iv, 77).

In short, 'an intelligent study' of the Holy Quran shows, not that it engenders fanaticism and inculcates indiscriminate slaughter or enslavement of all unbelievers, as Dr. Kumm informs us through Reuter's Agency, but that the essence of its teachings, Fight only against those who fight against you, but transgress not even during the war, and the object of your wars should be the establishment of peace and toleration.

If Dr. Kumm had with him in his travels a copy of Sale's Translation, he must also have had with him a copy of the Bible, for a devout Christian like him cannot travel without a Bible. It would have been well if along with the Sale's Translation, he had also made an intelligent study of his Bible and compared the commands of the God of the Bible with those of the Holy Quran. But if he has omitted to do, so I will do it for him.

The reader has seen the directions of the Holy Quran relating to war, let him now see what Bible has to say on the subject—

(a). "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, I will avenger the children of Israel of the Midianites.....And Moses sent them to the war, a thousand of every tribe.....And they warred against the Midianites, and the Lord commanded Moses; and they slew all the males. And they slew the kings of Midian beside the rest of them that were slain, five kings of Midian; Balaam also they slew with the sword. And the children of Israel took all women of Midian captives, and their little ones, and took the spoil of all their cattles and all their flocks, and all their goods. And they burnt all their cities where they dwelt, and all the goodly castles with fire. And they took all the spoil, and the prey, both of men and of beasts. And they brought the captives and the prey and the spoil, unto Moses and Eleazar the priest, and unto the congregation of the children of Israel, into the camp at the plains of Moab. And Moses, and Eleazar the priest and the princes of the congregation, went forth to meet them without the camp. And Moses was wroth with the officers of the host, with the captains over thousands, and captains over hundreds, which came from the battle. And Moses said unto them, Have ye saved all the women alive? Behold, these caused the children of Israel, through the counsel of Balaam, to commit trespass against the Lord in the matter of Peor, and there was a plague among the congregation of the Lord. Now therefore kill every male among the little ones, and kill every woman that hath known man by lying with him. But all the women children, that have not known a man by lying with him, keep alive for yourselves." Numbers xxxi, 1—18.

(b). "And the Lord spake unto Moses in the plains of Moab by Jordan near Jericho, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel and say unto them, When ye are passed over Jordan, into the land of Canaan, then ye shall drive out all the inhabitants of the land

from before you and destroy all their pictures, and destroy all their molten images, and quite pluck down all their high places. And ye shall dispossess the inhabitants of the land from before you and destroy all their pictures, and destroy all their molten images and quite pluck down all their high places. And ye shall dispossess the inhabitants of the land, and, dwell therein : for I have given you the land to possess it. . . . But if ye will not drive out the inhabitants of the land from before you then it shall come to pass, that those which ye let remain of them, shall be pricks in your eyes, and thorns in your sides, and shall vex you in the land wherein ye dwell." (Numbers xxxiv, 50—55).

(c). " So the Lord our God delivered into our hands Og also, the king of Bashan, and all his people and we smote him until none was left to him remaining. And we took all his cities at that time; there was not a city which we took not from them. Deut. iii, 3-4). .

(d). " And we took all his cities at that time, and utterly destroyed the men, and the women, and the little ones, of every city we left none to remain." Deut. ii, 34).

(e). " And ye shall overthrow their altars and break their pillars and burn their groves with fire." (Deut. xii, 2).

(f). " And when the Lord thy God shall deliver them before thee; thou shalt smite them and utterly destroy them, thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor show mercy unto them." (Deut. vii. 2).

(g). " And they utterly destroyed all that was in the city, both man and woman, young and old, and ox, and sheep, and ass, with the edge of the sword." (Joshua vi, 21).

(h). " And they burned the city with fire and all that was therein; only the silver, and the gold, and the vessels of brass and of iron, they put into the treasury of the House of the Lords." (Joshua vi, 24).

(i). " And it shall be, that he that is taken with the accursed thing shall be burnt with fire, he and all that he hath." (Joshua vii, 15).

(j). " And Joshua said, Why hast thou troubled us? The Lord shall trouble thee this day. And all Israel stoned him with stones, and burned them with fire, after they had stoned them stones." (Joshua vii, 25).

(k). " And it came to pass, when Israel had made an end of

slaying all the inhabitants of Ai in the field, in the wilderness wherein they chased them when they were all fallen on the edge of the sword, until they were consumed, that all the Israelites returned unto Ai, and smote it with the edge of the sword. And so it was, that all that fell that day, both of men and women, were 12,000, even all the men of Ai. For Joshua drew not his hand back wherewith he stretched out the spear, until he had utterly destroyed all the inhabitants of Ai. . . . And Joshua burnt Ai, and made it an heap for ever, a desolation, un'o this day. And the king of Ai he hanged on a tree until eventide." (Joshua. viii, 24—29).

(l). "So Joshua smote all the country of the hills, and of the south, and of the vale, and of the springs, and all their kings; he left none remaining, but utterly destroyed all that breathed, as the Lord God of Israel commanded." (Joshua x, 40).

(m). 'Howbeit Sisera fled away on his feet to the tent of Jae, the wife of Heber, the Kenite. . . . And Jael, went out to meet Sisera, and said unto him, Turn in, my Lord turn in to me; fear not; and when he had turned in unto her into the tent, also covered him with a mantle Then Jael took a nail of the tent, and took an hammer in her hand and went softly unto him, and smote the nail into his temples; for he was fast asleep, and weary: so he died Blessed above women shall Jael the wife of Heber be; blessed shall she be above women in the tent." (Judges iv, 17—21; d. 24).

(n). "Have they not divided the prey, to every man, v damsel or two?" (Judges v, 30).

(o). "And all the people likewise cut down every man his bough, and followed Abimelech, and put them to the hold, and set the hold on fire upon them, so that all the men of the tower of Shechem died also, about a thousand men and women." (Judges ix, 49).

(p). "And he (David) took their king's crown from off his head, the weight whereof was a talent of gold with the precious stones and it was set on David's head And he brought forth the people that were there, and put them under harrows of iron and under axes of iron and made them pass through brickkilns, and thus did he unto all the cities of the children of Ammon." (ii Samuel, xii, 30—31; i Chronicles xx, 2 and 3).

(q). "So Jehu slew all that remained of the house of Ahad in Jezreel, and all his great men, and his kinsfolks, and his priests, until he left him none remaining." (lii Kings. x, ii).

(r). "Then Menaham smote Tiphshah and all that were therein, and the coasts thereof from Tirzah; because they opened not to him, therefore he smote it, and all the women therein that were with child he ripped up." (ii Kings vv, 16).

(s). "And as Josiah turned himself, he spied the sepulchres that were there in the mount and sent, and took the bones out of the sepulchres, and burned them on the altar, and polluted it according to the word of the Lord, which the man of God proclaimed, who proclaimed these words." (ii Kings; xiii, 16.)

Such were the wars that were fought by the Prophets and kings of Israel, according to the command of the Lord. There was the levelling of the houses with the ground, the setting of cities on fire, the burning of the orchards and green trees to ashes, the total destruction of all that breathed, the wholesale slaughter of men, women and children and even of oxen, asses and sheep, the driving of nails into heads, the putting of men under laws, and under barrows and axes of iron, the burning of men in towers, the ripping up of women that were with child, the taking out and burning of the bones of the dead, and lastly there was the command of the Lord to make no covenant and to have no mercy. This was done according to the will of the Lord and was done by men like Moses, Joshua and David. Mark what the Holy Word of God says of these holy persons. Of Moses, God says, "And there arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face." (Deut. xxxiv, 10.) Moses is also spoken of as the 'Chosen' of God. Of David it is said, "David, who kept my commandments, and who followed me with all his heart, to do that only which was right in mine eyes." (I Kings, xiv, 8). Again, "David did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord" (I Kings xv, 5). Of Joshua, the Bible says: "And Joshua, the son of Nun, was full of the spirit of wisdom." Deut, xxx iv, 9.)

Now one who believes in the Bible to be the Word of God should be ashamed to attack the Holy Quran whose directions regarding war are ideal directions even for the most enlightened people. Let Dr. Kumun compare the above quotations from the Bible with the very human directions which the Holy Prophet gave to the army with which he went to Muta (Syria) to avenge the murder of his envoy by the Christian prince, Sharhabil. "Be not guilty" said he, "of treachery and perfidy. Kill not the children, the women, the aged and those that lead retired lives in their cells. Approach not a tree nor demolish any building. Let him also compare the Biblical accounts of the wars of Joshu:

the first successor to Moses, with the principles of justice and, moderation, laid down by Abu Bakr the first successor to the Holy Prophet for the guidance of the first expedition into Syria : " Be just, break not your plighted faith, mutilate none ; slay neither children, old men nor women ; injure not the date-palm nor burn it with fire, nor cut down any fruit-bearing tree, slay neither flocks nor herds nor camels, except for food ; perchance you may come across men who have retired into monasteries, leave them and their works in peace ; you may eat of the food that the people of the land will bring you in their vessels, making mention thereon of the name of God ; and you will come across people with shaven crowns, touch them only with the flat of the sword. Go forward now in the name of God and may He protect you in battle and pestilence." (' Preachings of Islam' by T. W. Arnold, page 50).

I think I have written enough to cause Dr. Kumm to blush at his gross misrepresentation of the teachings of the Holy Quran. It is now the duty of Reuter's Agency to publish the substance of this reply to Dr. Kumm just as they have given publicity to his attack on the teaching of the Muslim faith.

“ ATTITUDE OF THE HOLY QURAN TOWARDS OTHER REVEALED SCRIPTURES AND ITS CLAIM TO PRECEDENCE.”

By M. Muhammad Din, B.A.

From times immemorial, human society has been obliged to bow down before the unseen and the inevitable. It has seen limitations put to its ubiquitous enquiry after the unseen and the unrealisable. The experience of the learned and the wise has led to the discovery of the existence of the prime cause of everything and fully exploded the so-called doctrine of the spontaneity of commencement. “ Some antecedent condition or conditions must precede any event ” They have come to the conclusion that events do not follow one another irregularly, indiscriminately or capriciously. They think, and rightly so that every phenomenon of the present is linked with some phenomena of the past ; that the present condition of things is one end of an iron chain of causation, at the other end of which must have been the primary or first cause.

It is obvious and self-evident that the primary cause which we call by the name of God or Allah or Parmeshwar must be infinite in its essence or attributes. On the other hand it is admitted on all hands that human faculties and resources are after all finite and limited all notwithstanding the insatiable thirst and lofty aspirations man may have to the contrary. Our every day experience corroborates this.

Amongst the many advantages of experience, one of the most valuable is that we come to know the range of our own powers, and if we are wise we keep contented by within them. Man being finite, cannot understand the infinite, unless the infinite comes to his help. This is why we can not say that we know all about any and every thing. We can not say anything for certain even about the common things. We can not even sound the depths of our parents' hearts, who are so dear and near to us. *A portion* we can not know anything about God, unless He by His own love and all pervading providence reveal something about himself. But God being the Prime Cause, it was necessary that this frail humanity should have known some of the obligations it owed to that Supreme Being, and He in the nature of the case was to reveal His will, not that He was bound to do so, but because the needs of humanity that was weltering and wallowing in the mire of its inherent materialistic tendencies, that required that it should be given something of the light without which its existence was mere groping in the dark. Hence God in the fulness of His love and mercy revealed everything that was necessary for the emancipation of man from the bondage of his downward

going tendencies. Nay, more he was given to understand that he could make eternal progress and hold communion with God Himself.

Then began that chain of revelation which is the subject of this paper. How that chain gained in length and strength will be discussed here. But before we take up the question in earnest, it is necessary for us to have a glance back.

Man, we came to know, stood in need of revelation from on high. We began with experience as our basis and the world as a settled fact. Even here our own experience and the experience of these that preceded us will act as our guide. For instance it is God who sends down rain from the clouds. God is Almighty; He could do this without resorting to any means, but still our observation and experience tell us that He employs means whenever He wishes to send down rain. No natural phenomenon occurs without the agency of the means. So in sending down revelation, God selects some persons from among the common run of mankind. They are called the chosen ones of God who fulfil His mission here on earth. They are specially designed for this purpose. They are the mouthpiece of Heaven in a way. They are purified, like distilled water, of every impurity. They are pure metals cleansed of every dross and it is through these people that God reveals His own will.

What should be the nature of this revelation would be clear now. It is the expression of the will of God in human speech. It is what ennobles man's character and leads him higher and higher until he soars high in heavens, and seeks communion with God and finds rest and comfort in His lap for He is the goal of everything. It is at once a code of law and spiritual magnetism which directs as well as attracts and purifies man. This revelation embodied in books, or tablets or found in people's memory is designated as the Holy Book.

Now we come to a somewhat different question. Here on the face of this globe we have got many books whose followers claim divine origin for them. The Jews, the Christians, the Moham-medans, the Hindus, the Parsis and the Buddhists, etc., have their own books and each insists upon the acceptance of his own to the exclusion of every other. Had the subject been one, though in different tongues, or had there been harmony of opinion between the followers of different books, all would have been well. But the difficulty is that each party not only advances its own claims, but also repudiates vehemently the claims of all others. The Arya with his *Niyoga*, i.e., (the doctrine permitting a woman to have sexual intercourse with strangers) and Transmigration, the Christian with his doctrine of Atonement and the Crucifixion of God, the Parsee with his gods of Good and Evil and the Musalman

with his ideas of Forgiveness and Submission to the Will of God are all contending for master. We have discussed the necessity of divine revelation but the difficulties crop up when we examine individual cases. How should we bring order out of this chaos. Where should we search for harmony when there is a jarring discord of opinions. The Christians and the Jews say that God selected only two tribes out of the sons of Israel upon whom He showered his special favours and let all the world go without them. It appears that neither these children of Israel stood in special need of revelation on account of some of the heinous deeds which they committed for which a special warning was required, or, that God purposely intended eternal perdition for the whole mankind with the exception of a few favoured indwellers of the valley of Jordon. But the matters did not end here. The Jews and the Christians would both differ on the personality of Jesus, son of Mary, whom the former regarded and still regard as an impostor, while the latter worship him as the son of God. Yet both of them are agreed on the fact of of an eternal seal having been set to the divine revelation.

So is the case with the Hindus and the Parsees. They believe in the necessity of divine revelation and say that God spoke to the sages of yore. But He spoke only in former times as if He were like a carbine that has discharged itself once and then stands in need of some one to recharge it.

Such doctrines look preposterous and human nature revolts at the idea of such niggardliness being ascribed to the all-loving God. When humanity is the same struggling mass that it once was when God felt Himself responsive to its needs, it is inconceivable why the necessity of divine revelation should be dispensed with now. When we have the same cause working here, why should we not expect the same effect. Man and his environments remaining the same, why should there be a change in God. By the way, if He is subject to the law of change, He is not infinite, for that would amount to the total denial of His existence which we have reason to believe as imperatively inevitable. It is to the eternal disgrace of these systems that they inculcate such doctrines. It is the one source of life, which if drawn, would leave mere leas for the vault to brag of. When the world was in its infancy, then God was merciful enough to revel His will to this herd of mankind, but when that herd increased and mutual war and feuds sprang up, and material tendencies completely shrouded what was divine in man, then the all-loving, all-seeing and all-wise God excused Himself on the plea that He had expressed Himself once for all, though that 'once' be millions and millions of years back.

There is another consideration which belies such a doctrine as the one stated above. A blacksmith strikes hard when he sees the iron hot. He knows the time and the occasion proper for such an act. He strikes softly now and then because he sees the moment is not ripe for striking hard. It is his knowledge which withholds him from acting rashly. He would be an ill expert who does not see the time or the moment. Prescience is the one quality that is needful for all exquisiteness in work. We have got an ever progressing world before us. It would have been an ungainly, and ill-judged act on the part of the Divine Being to thrust His will at a time when the world was not ripe for the occasion. Or just take the example of a physician. He prescribes differently to different patients under his treatment. At one stage of the disease he applies one remedy and at another, another. This action of his does not denote ignorance on his part. It is his complete knowledge of the working of human constitution that makes him prescribe differently on different occasions. The same has been the case with human nature. It has been evolving itself out gradually. It would have been an unwise and unlovely act of God, had He applied the same remedy at every stage. In its onward course humanity has been passing from one lower grade to the next higher one, and then to the next higher one and so on. Such a conduct on God's part would have implied total ignorance of the working of human nature and its needs.

So far we have seen that the books we commonly call by the name of Holy or Revealed Books recognise the need and existence of such a thing as divine revelation to man and we have also seen that these different systems err on the side of restricting it to one period of human history, ignoring human nature on the one side and depriving God of some of the most prominent attributes, such as knowledge, wisdom and love, without which even God is no God at all. But herein steps in one book with the following proclamation :—

“ There has been no such tribe or nation to which a warner was not sent, and thou art, O Prophet, but one of the warners. Therefore believers are those who believe in what has been sent down unto thee, and in what was sent down before thee and who put faith in what is to come.” The Quran is explicit on the subject. It not only accepts all those revelations that were sent before it was revealed to the world, but it also takes the responsibility on its shoulders to announce the revelation to come. Had there been no such announcement the ardour of those who walk and work in the path of righteousness would have cooled down. There would have been no incitement or spur to action. If at this stage of the world's development and culture people

were to be informed that henceforth no discovery could be made no any new thing invented, provided the rumour were true, there would be a complete upsetting of the whole organization. In that case none would take the trouble of meddling with these things. Then the world would fall on its evil days again because change is the one condition of healthy life. There would be disruption, disintegration and complete breakdown. When such are the concomitants of unhealthy life, the more truly destructive would be the consequences of the cessation of divine revelation to the spiritual life. There is another verse in the Holy Book which runs to the self-same tune—and the Holy Quran is full of such references and allusions—and it is as follows:—"The prophet believes in what is sent down to him from his God and the believers do the same. All believe in God, His angels, His books and His prophets and they make no distinction between any of the prophets. They make no disparaging comparison and contrast." Herein the Musalmans are ordered to believe and put faith in all the prophets without any distinction. To crown all there is a message of peace to all nations and creeds in the following verses:—"O prophet, summon these Christians and Jews and the Sabians and the followers of other systems by proclaiming reverence for all. Say that we the Muslims believe in God and that which has been sent down to the prophets of yore—to Abraham and Ishmael and Isaac and Jacob and their descendants as well as to Moses and Jesus. No difference do we make between any of the prophets and to God are we resigned (Muslims). If those summoned respond to your call and reverence in the same spirit as ye do, then they are the guided, but if they reject and turn their backs to you, then verily they are in a state of separation from you and a wide gulf divides them from you and God will suffice to protect thee against them; and He is the hearer and knower. (This is the humanest way possible to come to terms with upholders of different religions). Verily this is God's baptism, and one who wishes to join this fold, must pass through this baptism. We have the Baptism of God and who is the better to baptize than God? And Him do we serve. Say O Prophet: will you dispute with us about God when He is our Lord and your Lord! we have our works and ye have your works, and we show forth to him a pure faith. Will ye say, verily Abraham and Ishmael and Isaac and Jacob and the tribes were Jews or Christians? And who is more in fault than he who concealeth the witness which he hath from God? But God is not regardless of what ye say. That people have now passed away, they have the reward of their deeds and for you is the meed of yours, but of their doings ye shall not be questioned." In these verses we find an exposition of that

religion of humanity from which the people had fallen off. As God's worldly gifts are not restricted to any class, clan or creed, so are His Spiritual blessings not confined to any one people. The religion of Islam is a religion of obedience and resignation to the will of God. Whenever any new revelation is sent down the Muslims are required to believe in it as well as we as in those that were revealed before—"the revelations will be sent to you time after time. O Sons of Adam : therefore whoso believes in the revelation whenever it comes is guided in the right path and no fear shall touch him nor shall he be grieved." Then he who wishes to join the pale of Muslim Brotherhoods should be ready to sacrifice his narrowmindedness and bigotry. He shall not refuse reverence and respect to the founders of other religious systems—nay he should practise them. This was the original purity from which other religious systems had fallen off and which Islam has established on the earth. This was the starting point to which Islam drew attention and invited all sane, thinking and God fearing people to join the common brotherhood. If they accepted this invitation, that is, they forsook their bigotedness and intolerance for wider human sympathy, then of course they were welcome, for this was the right path, but if they refused, then there was a world of difference between them and the Musalmans, for no Musalman could brook his leaders and elders being railled and reviled in his presence. When he respects the leaders of other religious systems, why should others dare to revile his own. His God forbids him to say aught against the gods of other nations for the ignorant will not stop short of reviling even the very God of Islam. Such are the behests of the Holy Quran. This was the divine baptism with which Islam baptised its followers. God indignantly repudiates the assertion that Abraham and the host of other people belonged to this sect or that. They were Muslims, i.e., their religion was resignation to the will of God, which is the essence of Islam. Like true Muslims they obeyed what was revealed to them and what was revealed before them, and they had firm faith in the revelation to come.

Now comes in the question of drawing a line of demarcation between one revelation and the other. Have we got any hard or fast rules to guide us ? Why do the Musalmans act upon the ordinances of the Quran to the exclusion of every other book ? It is a long and complex question, and I shall try my best to steer clear of all the difficulties that beset the inquirer after truth. To be brief it would be sheer injustice and highhandedness on the part of a person who tries to forge any line of demarcation where there is, or should be, none. We are ordered to believe in each and every revelation that is sent down. We are enjoined not to

make any distinction. Here at this stage comes in the question of Musalmans following the Quran to the exclusion of every other book. For this purpose let us go a little deeper into the question.

First let us see what is the Quran's verdict on this point and then we shall try to find out its accuracy in the light of history. In the first place the Holy Quran speaks of the former revelations as having been tampered with by human agency. The writers of those revealed books have hopelessly mixed the Word of God with the word of man. It is now next to impossible to sift out truth from falsehood. For instance we take up the Bible and the Vedas. The former contains some sixty-six books by different authors. One is at a loss to understand the term of Holy Book being given to such story books. Only a short perusal will disclose the fact that it is not a revealed book in the real sense of the term. It is a chronicle of the children of Abraham that settled in Judea and Samaria. Herein are depicted all those vicissitudes which the children of Israel underwent. There is very little of inspired matter in it. As history it is even inferior to Buckley's History of England, for there we have a complete and connected narrative while that of the Bible is fragmentary and disjointed. It is only in some such books as Deuteronomy Isaiah and Psalms that one comes across some faint glimpses of revelation. Even here the authorship by another hand is quite apparent. Only one instance from the Old Testament would suffice here. The first five books are said to be the work of Moses. Deuteronomy is the fifth one in order. In the 34th chapter of this book we find it written "And the Lord said unto him (Moses) this is the land which I swore unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob saying I will give it unto thy seed : I have caused thee to see it with thine eyes, but thou shalt not go over thither. So Moses the servant of God, died there in the land of Moab, according to the word of the Lord. And he buried him in a valley in the land of Moab, over against Bethpeor, but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day. And Moses was an hundred and twenty years old when he died, his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated and the children of Israel wept for Moses in the plains of Moab thirty days." Now can any sane person say this to be the work of Moses ? How could he write about his death and subsequent mourning over his loss.

About the New Testament suffice it to say that the first four Gospels contain narratives about Jesus' three years ministry in Judea. We can challenge each and every Christian to produce any verse or verses purporting to mean that whatever is written in these Gospels is a revelation from God to Jesus, son of Mary. When this is not so, it is idle talk to go on making fuss over

Christian Revelation and what not. The other part of the New Testament consists of the Acts of Apostles and their epistles which evidently mean the Acts of Apostles after the crucifixion affair and the epistles of Paul and others. There is a considerable internal evidence to prove that the first four Gospels are mere biographies in a restricted sense of the word. For instance, Luke begins his book "For as much as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us, even as they delivered them to us, which from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word, it seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mightest know the certainty of those things wherein thou hast been instructed..." Herein the writer acknowledges the fact that seeing many others writing accounts about Jesus, he is encouraged to do the same for some person who is evidently not so well acquainted with the real story of Jesus. Here there is no mention of divine revelation nor the Holy Ghost's assistance, therefore how can the Christians venture to put down their books in the category of revealed Books? If they are revealed books, one is justified to include *Æsop's Fables* and *Plutarch's Lives*, &c, in the category of Heavenly books. Even to this day we possess a collection of the apocryphal Gospels which Christian piety could not sanction for reasons best known to itself, but we on our part see no reason why they should not be included in the New Testament story-books. And that even these story-books have been tampered with is admitted by all the Christian writers of repute. The last chapter of the Gospel according to John is universally conceded to be the result of some later pious fraud. Higher critics, both in Germany and Holland, go the length of declaring the whole as an impious job. Only the following sentences are considered to be actual words of Jesus uttered on different occasions—

1. My Lord, my Lord, why hast thou forsaken me.
2. But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.
3. Why callest thou me good, for none is good save the father.

In the face of so many overwhelming arguments against the authenticity of the so called Christian Scriptures, bold indeed would be the man who makes a futile effort to prove the revealed character of these books.

As to the Vedas, even Daya Nand could not feel sure of the purity of the text of the Atharva Veda, hence his verdict on its

unauthenticity. A short perusal of the Rig Veda will prove that it is nothing but an effusion of a burning soul or souls after the conquest and vanquishment of the aborigines of India. They are the outpourings of the rough and the rude who see nothing beyond the elements of nature. They are overawed by the grand spectacle presented to them by nature. They do not see through these elements. On the contrary these elements are to them the very gods. In fact the Vedas proclaim nothing but nature worship, mixed and confused sometimes with ideas about the Supreme Being, and if God ever occupies any place, that is in the background. Such book can never be cited as an example of the Holy Book.

When such is the piteable plight to which the so-called heavenly books had been reduced, then what should have been the measures adopted by the Almighty for the promulgation of a New Law. The Holy Quran solves this riddle too. At first it pictures out the conditions of the times in as brief and sententious a way as is its characteristic. It says, the land as well as the sea had become corrupted. The sea became tumultuous and stormy. Confusion was reigning supreme even in those books which had some semblance of revealed character about them. To remedy this evil, it was necessary to sift truth from falsehood. God only knows the date and place when this chain of revelation began and the extent to which it had already spread. But now truth and falsehood were in equally mixed up with each other and it was impossible for man to attempt such a stupendous task. It was God alone who could do this and He did it in a way that we will consider now.

The revelations that had been sent down up to this time were of two sorts, the one was of universal character and the other of temporary nature. They were intended for the local needs and were not of a universal nature. Besides this, the time had come when East and West were to be united into a composite whole. Therefore there was a great need for a revelation of a universal nature. Therefore in the revealing of the Quran, God reformulated what was of a universal nature in the old revelation and added those portions that were not revealed as yet which were also of universal character because a new era had dawned upon the whole mankind. God begins His new dispensation with the following verses —

“Corruption has appeared among the people of the book as well as among those to whom no book has been sent down, from no unjust motive on God's part, but on account of the misdeeds of these people. Know Ye, O people: that God has been gracious to you. He is going to revive this earth after its spiritual death that had come over it. He wishes to show you, and direct you

in, the paths of those righteous people that have passed before you. All previously revealed books are contained in this book, To-day He intends to sum up and crown His former revelations by the sending down of this book (Quran.) Here there is a clear exposition of the position adopted by the Holy Quran with relation to other books. It recognises their holy origin but it regards their texts as perverted and interpolated. So at this juncture it was necessary that those revelations should be purified of the dross that was concealing their pure character. The former books had become a kind of metallic ore out of which pure metal was to be extracted in the fiery furnace of divine revelation. Those who have studied other books than the Quran are of opinion that the general essence and the common teaching of all is to be found in the Holy Quran. This is why the Musluma, though believing in the pre-Islamic revelations, refuse to act upon the teachings of other books except the Quran; of course it should be so. It is not incumbent to follow such perverted and ireterpolated text as would only create confusion and distrust. The Quran is Tennyson's one law, one element and one far off divine to which the whole creation moved.

THE RELIGION OF LOVE.

The prevalent idea about Islam in the minds of Christian people is that it is a religion which turns out models of cruelty and truculence from its horribly powerful mill, which monsters spread over the face of the earth unrest and disorder, destroying everything, treading upon life and honour, wasting populated countries and turning every nation into slaves. We say to them, We are a peaceful people, we give the message of universal brotherhood to all colours and all nations, we do not make war but in defence; when we conquered nations, we treated them as our brothers, we gave in their hands the Government of their own countries, we raised them to high posts such as your own governments can not trust foreigners with, in spite of all your ideas of liberty and self-government. We effaced in our own time the difference of white and black which you can not and will not. Still they say, "you are a cruel people" || we have been hearing so from our cradles upwards. It is true the acutest eye can not perceive and differentiate rain-bow colours in the dark of the night. The wars of Moses and Joshua, the burning to ashes of life and property—when men, women, children and houses were destroyed with equal indifference—are tolerated as done by the Will of God, but the defensive battles of the Prophet of Islam are held as patterns of cruelty. Perhaps our Christian friends mean that when the enemies of Mohammad conspired to kill him, he should have destroyed his followers with his own hand and then offered himself to be stoned by the triumphant idol-worshippers. No sane man would have hearkened to this evil-designed advice. In the strife of good and evil, good has an eternal right to crush the encroaching evil. We present to them the frank, straightforward, truthful and charming life of our prophet and challenge them to compare the life of Jesus with it. We turn their attention to the practical good which Islam has done to the world: how it and it alone has established the true Unity of God with all His perfect qualities, how it has embraced all nations in its arms, how it has given to the world an idea of true liberty and equality. And what has Christianity done? It has given the taste of wine to all the nations of the world and set ruinous examples of life. When we ask them proofs of their cardinal doctrines: they say we believe with faith and not with reason. Faith no doubt is a good thing, but what is that faith which can not bear the light of reason. They say their's is a loving God and the God which Islam presents bases all His laws on the principle of punishment and reward. Do they not know that the Christian God is devoid of the quality of mercy which is imperfectly supplemented by Christ and the mercy of Christ does no good to non-Christians whom the

Christian God threatens with eternal hell from which they are never to be taken out ? The God of Islam says, My wrath touches whom I will, but My mercy extends over every thing, (vii, 156).

My object in this paper is to give a view of the loving and merciful character of the God and prophet of Islam. The main object of Islam is expressed in this way in the Quran, " You are the best people sent out for the good of the world you must bid the people to do that which is good and save them from evil," (iii, 106). The prophet hints at the same object when he says :— " Who believes in God must say a good thing or be silent," (Bukharee). The widely beneficial character of Islam is further explained by the prophet : " If one of you sees any one doing wrong, he must rectify him with his hand, if not, with his tongue, and if he can not do either, he must at least resent it in his heart and this is the weakest degree of faith." (Bukhari and Muslim).

" The prophet of God said, Every soul must do some deed of benevolence. The people asked, ' What about those who can not.' The prophet said, They must work with their hands, profit themselves and do good to others. The people said, ' What, if one can not do even this.' The prophet said, He must help a poor, destitute person in his work. They said ' If one can not do even this.' The prophet, said ' Let him bid other people to do good, and if he can not do even this, let him do no evil himself, and it will be on his part a benevolence. The prophet says, A good word is an act of charity" (Bukhari). About our relations with the non-Muslim nations the Quran has the following comprehensive teachings : " Fight with those only who fight with you and never take the aggressive part." (ii, 186). " If you are greeted with a good word, return a better greeting or equal to it." (iv, 88). " If your enemies stoop to peace, you should make peace and trust in God, if you fear a breach of faith) certainly God knows and hears." (viii, 63). " If you make a treaty, hold to it as long as the other party does, for God loves those who fear Him" (ix, 7). The contexts of these extracts will show that they are all about the relations of a Muslim with his enemies who do not profess his faith and about men of the same faith ; in Islam there must be no war at all, for the blood of a Muslim when it is shed by his brother advertently and without cause deprives the culprit of his faith. God further commands the Muslims to extend a charitable hand towards their unbelieving brothers : " God does not forbid you to treat virtuously those who did not fight you for your faith or turn you out of your homes ; give them their due, for God loves the equitable, but God forbids you to make friends with those who fought you on account of your faith and

turned you out of your homes and helped to eject you from the land ; and who does this, does injustice to himself " (ix, 8, 9). This quotation plainly and quite naively illustrates the principle of the wars of the Prophet of Islam and the treatment which foreigners should expect from the hands of the Mu-lims. The almost universal remonstrance in the modern world is that powerful nations do not stoop down to look into the state of their subjects whom they govern. The one principle of government is the benefit of the rulers and not the ruled. These governors who look to the interest and policy of their governments are called statesmen, and those who look after the welfare of the people are called administrators. The interest of the government is always given preference to that of the subjects. Modern governments do not want administrators : they require astute statesmen. In this utilitarian age of ours the weak must go to the wall, and in ' the devil take the hindmost ' policy of headlong completion which is exultingly styled as ' the survival of the fittest ' we often find all laws of humanity and goodness set at naught by the egoistic expounders of these theories. But the number of worthless people who demand to be provided with means of living has obliged them to take benevolent measures, though for their own selfish ends. " Fling them a penny, they disturb my peace." The relations of servants and masters are equally unsatisfactory. You may travel through the length and breadth of this country and you will not find a hundred masters who trust their servants or servants who love their masters. A wonderful estrangement is working between man and man. The best of men (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) said long ago foreseeing all these evils : " Those who serve you are your brothers : God has placed them under you. So whoever has his brother under him, let him feed his brother from his own dish and clothe him from out of his own clothes that he himself wears and not toil them more than they can bear, and if you do, help them in their work." How masterly does my master decide once for all the questions of labour and wages, rights and rewards, which have puzzled the modern world. Our servants, nor our subjects, are to be considered radically inferior to us. We are brothers as men. It is not service but help. We have no right to exact labour from them. It is a transitory eclipse in their life, not a permanent blot. They are not like beasts shut off from the domain of rationality and progress. They may any day be our equals, therefore, the Prophet of God says, ' Treat them as your brothers ' Such is the rule of Islam, if it rules over any subject nation. On a day when the Prophet was telling the story of a man who had saved the life of a dog, some one asked, " Shall we be rewarded for animals ? ", " Yes," he said " for every living creature."

The personal life of the Prophet is not less charming. Anas, who served him for ten years from the day of his arrival at Medina to the last day of his life in this world, says that the prophet never rebuked him for any fault during the whole time. The age of Anas at the death of the Prophet was twenty years. For the first forty years of his life Mohammad (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) seems to have been a quiet sort of virtuous youth without ambition and deas of self-aggrandisement. The usual channel which the minds of rising Arabian youths adopted was poetry and rhetoric which two could secure them highest honour and power among their countrymen. Poets were the most honourable chiefs of the country and it was considered a point of honor to have a poet as one's guest. Readers of pre-Islamic Arabian history know all this very well. But Mohammad (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) had no faculty and no liking for poetry. The Quran says, "We have not taught him poetry and it is not worth his dignity." He during the Prophet) his whole career could not repeat a single line even of another man's verses correctly. If it had not been the Will of God, he would have died unknown to the world as appears from his use of the first forty years of his life which are the days of rising ambition. In this part of life the development of man's powers reaches its climax and we can safely say that which is unborn of the powers of a man up to this time does not exist in him at all. The great hurricanes of the world Alexander, Timur and Napoleon were all young men. The Prophet had nothing with him but his private virtue and the purity of his life. When the first revelation of God descended upon him, his mind was greatly disturbed and he ran to his house and called his wife and said, "Cover me with clothes, O Khadija, my life is in peril." Then he related to her what he had seen. She soothed him and said, "By, God, By God, He will never let you be lost. You honour your guest and provide for your relatives and help to lighten the burden of the poor and you are a good adviser in times of danger." The Prophet now began to preach the Word of God as it came to him. The gist of the whole teaching is that nothing in the universe has independent merit but the perfect God, every thing else depends upon Him for existence and progress. La-elaha illallah. The idol-worshippers of Arabia sneered at the new idea and they strongly opposed him. A true picture of these times is found in the Mekki Chapters of the Quran. "The rich men of his nation said, 'We do not find you but as a man like one of us, and we do not see any one following you but those who are evidently the meanest among us. We do not see any cause of superiority in you over us; on the other hand, we think you liars. He said, O my people, look, if I have God's evidences with me and He has poured down His grace upon me and

your eyes are blind to it, should I force you to accept when you resent it," (xi). "O my nation, look, If I have God's evidences with me and He has provided me with an honourable living (the question was of dishonesty in trade), I do not intend but to reform as much as I can, and I have no power but that which God gives me, I place my trust in God and I turn to Him. O my people let not my enmity incite you to crime so that you may receive as the tribes of Noah, Hood and Salih received, and the tribe of Lot is not far away from you. Beg forgiveness from your Lord and then turn to Him, My Lord is Kind and Merciful." "They said, We do not understand most of what you say and we see that you are powerless in our hands, and if it had not been for your clan, we would have stoned you to death, and we do not honour your life." (xi).

"Do you kill a man because he says, My Lord is God, and he has brought to you evidences from your Lord; if he be a liar his lie will be his ruin, and if he is true in what he says, you will receive something of what he threatens you with, God never prospers a wicked liar," (xi).

"When the unbelievers were maturing their schemes to imprison you or murder you or to banish you out of the land," (viii). When the matters had reached this stage and all remedies had failed to cure the stiff-necked people of Arabia, it was time for condemnation. The Quran says, "Look at the Heaven and the Earth and the signs they contain; neither signs nor your threatenings are of any avail to this nation of unbelievers. Do they await such evil days as wicked nations before them had; tell them, be patient, I will also wait with you. On that day do we save our prophets and those who have believed, thus it is binding on us to save the believers," (x, 101). When that evil morning dawned it was announced: "Like the people of Pharaoh and those that were before them, they belied the signs of their Lord; we destroyed them for their crimes and we drowned the people of Pharaoh, and all these were culprits." (viii, 56). This is a short sketch of the life of our prophet. If we read the lives of all the prophets of God, we will find that the life of Mohammad in the Old testament especially the five books of Moses, is a big model, of whom all prophets are but faint likenesses yet true in form and feature. Still the Christians say he was an impostor. If it be true, there is no criterion by which we can know a true man from an impostor. It is needless here to mention the life and death relation which his followers had with the Prophet, they are too well-known to be mentioned and no one dare deny them. The following extract will show how his followers felt towards him :—

"We have among us a prophet of God who reads His book when the sun furls the curtains of the night. He showed us the way when we were blind; our hearts are convinced that his words shall be fulfilled. He passes his nights and his sides do not touch his bed, when the beds of the unbelievers are breaking with the burden of their bulky bodies." Lines of poetry by a follower of the Prophet; (Bukhari). The following instances from the life of the Prophet best explain his personal character which seems to be a perfect model of gentleness and good nature as the Quran says: Rama-tulilalamin 'A mercy for the worlds.' Anas says: I was walking with the Prophet of God when an ignorant man of the desert came and took hold of the mantle that the Prophet was wearing and gave a hard pull so that I saw the thick borders of the mantle made an impression on his neck, and said, 'Give me some money, O Mohammad, which you have.' The Prophet smiled and ordered some money to him." This was at the time of the ascendance of Islam in Medina. (Bukhari).

"A woman came to the Prophet and presented a mantle to him which she had woven with her own hands for the Prophet. The prophet was sorely in need of one and took it. He came out to us and he was wearing it for trousers. A man touched it and said, "Give me this to wear." The prophet said "very well." then he sat with the company for sometime, and when he went in, he sent the mantle to the man who had asked it. The people said to him, 'You did not do well in asking this of him' you knew that he never rejects when he is asked anything.' The man said, "I required it to be my winding sheet when I die, ; Sahl says it was so." (Bukhari). Readers of the traditions of the Prophet compiled in the books of Bukhari and Muslim would find hundreds of similar instances. They are quoted here to procure to the reader a side glance at the life of the Prophet. It is sometimes said that the Prophet did not hesitate to destroy life. Nothing can be farther from the truth. In the first place there is the command of God, "Slay not any one whom God hath forbidden you, unless for a just cause." (vi, 152). Again, "Who slayeth any one, unless it be a person guilty of manslaughter or of violence in the land, shall be as though he had slain all mankind," (v, 30). The following anecdotes will illustrate the practice of the Prophet. Miqudad said to the Prophet of God "I met with a man of the unbelievers, he fought with me and cut off one of my arms with a sword, took shelter behind a tree, and said, I submit myself to God. O prophet of God he cut off my hand first and said this word afterwards; should I kill him? The prophet of God said, "You shall not kill him, for if you do, he will be in the same position in which you were before you

killed him, and you will be in his position before he said the word that he has said" (Bukhari).

"We were sent on an expedition by the Prophet of God. I found a man who said *La-elaha illallah*: (There is no God beside Allah). I lanced him and then repented. I mentioned it to the Prophet of God who said, 'Did he say *La-elaha illallah* and you killed him.' I said, 'He spoke this fearing my weapon. The Prophet said "Did you break his heart to see whether he had sincerely said it or no," and he never ceased reiterating the same till I longed that I had not believed before that day."

"In a fight with the unbelievers one of the enemy had killed many Muslims when one Muslim turned his sword upon him, and when he had lifted it to strike, the unbeliever said, *La-elaha illallah*. (There is no God beside Allah,) but the Muslim did not stop his hand and the unbeliever was killed. He came to the Prophet and informed him what had happened. The Prophet said 'Did you kill him.' The man said, 'O Prophet of God, he killed this man and that and the other, and thus named many persons. The Prophet said 'What will you do with *La-elaha illallah* on the day of judgment?' The man said 'Ask forgiveness for my sin.' But the Prophet repeated again, "What will you do with *La-elaha illallah* on the day of judgment" and went on saying it."

These anecdotes bear many precious facts: that Islam is such a religion that all feuds and enmities cease the moment one believes in the words *La-elaha illallah* and that the prophet endeavoured to save the lives of even his bitterest enemies whom no law in the world could protect against death, and that the love of the prophet for the salvation of our souls was really marvellous and that there can be no profession of faith, but that which comes out of sincerity, and consequently that the sword was not a means of conversion adopted by the Prophet. The prophet of Islam had no relish for blood. He forbade a man to kill the man who had said *La-elah illallah* such a time and place so that a single life might not be lost in vain, and that no soul might be deprived of a chance of being saved. Such sympathy and such love for mankind we will find nowhere but in the life of the Prophet. The current belief among Europeans that Islam was spread at the point of the sword seems to have arisen from a confusion of such an anecdote.

The prophet did not renounce his mercy till his last day and when it was the one day of triumph in his life, when the city of his birth was regained, and the centre of Arabian idol-worship and thus the real centre of the country was in his hand, he addressed his lost brethren who had been his enemies, in the words of Joseph in the Qur'n. The Quraish when asked what treatment they expected from him, said, quoting the word

of Joseph's brethren, "God has preferred you above us and we were purely guilty." He said, "Do not blame yourselves to-day, God forgive your sins, He is most merciful." The last words of the prophet were "To my Sublime Friend" pointing with his finger above, meaning God. If we should say that love of God was the profession of our Prophet, we would reach nearer truth. In cities and wildernesses, in famines and plenty, rich or poor he sees the manifestation of his God. In the mosque of Medina, sitting among friends and followers, in the thick of the battle fighting on horseback, in his house lying on his bed alone, or travelling on the back of a camel, he praises his mighty Creator. When he rides a camel, he praises his God; when he puts a morsel of food in his mouth, he praises his God; and when he goes to sleep, he praises Him. When he gets up from his bed, the first word he speaks is a praise of his Lord. The prayers of the Prophet for every occasion of his life are preserved for us in their original form, and we can form an idea of the man by their perusal and his ways. The Christians say, Islam is not a religion of love. We say to them Bring us, as many loving words addressed to God on every occasion by Jesus as our Prophet's prayers contain. But we do not know any words of Jesus but his exclamation to God at the time of his crucifixion, "O my God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me"—evidently not very dignified words. The Quran says: Say, If you love God, follow me (the Prophet), it will make you God's beloved." Love of God is the highest desideratum for the believers: "Those who believe have the strongest love for God" (Quran). Man's life depends upon manifold interests (which may be called loves) in multifarious. Thus love for wife and children and one to own-self; love for one's family, friends and nation; and love for one's country and mankind in general are necessary compliments of every man's life. Again, man can not get rid of his love for comfort, wholesome food and a good house. If we go on computing, we will find that man's interest multiply infinitely. We cannot say he can leave any of them, yet we can not also say he loves them equally. Times came when he has to sacrifice one for the other; the less for the greater is the general rule. When interests clash, it is the only remedy. God's words. 'You should have strongest love for me, would mean for all practical purposes that all other interests should be subordinated to the interest of God. In other words, we should love nothing that we love but for God. Our friend-ships, our feuds, our honour, must be all for God. His pleasure should reign even in our carnal desires. Thus the low will be raised by the presence of the High in it. To this the Prophet of God refers: The man who has three

qualities has found the relish of faith: that God and his Prophet be dearer to him than anything else may be his mother, his father or his brother, and that he should not love the man whom he loves but for God. Nothing is too mean and nothing too low to be done when countenanced by the Will of the Almighty, the All-Perfect Lord. He it is who created man out of nothing and to Him must we resign ourselves for further development. His love is not incompatible with the love of man, on the contrary the love of man finds its only justification in the love of God. For the love of mankind, the Prophet of God says: That which you love for yourselves the same must you love for your brother: none of you can have faith unless he does this." There is also a Christian aphorism to the effect but there is all this difference between the two: The Christian maxim runs: "Do unto others as you would that they should do unto you." According to the Christian saying, a man may pass his whole life without doing a single charitable act to his fellow beings. He may do them no evil—this is all that Jesus requires of him. He may not steal his neighbour's property because he does not want his own to be stolen, but he may not also help his neighbour in distress because he himself is too well off ever to reach that state. It is a give and take policy, a negative rule, to check crime. Even crime can not be extirpated by means of it. A clever robber may retort: I allow those whose goods I rob to take any measures they like against me: might is right. But the saying of the Prophet of God is a positive command to do good. The Christian version does not go farther than forbidding to do evil which is not a very lofty idea. Christ says, do as you wish that others should do to you; the Prophet of God says: do as you like to do to your own-self. There is a wide difference between the treatment which a man expects from his fellow men, and that which he does from his own-self. The Prophet says, care for other people as you care for your own-selves; Christ says, care for other people as they care for you. There is all the difference of a highly benevolent and an extremely selfish statement between the saying of the Prophet and that of Christ. Let us again turn to the question of God's Mercy on which we all believe depends our salvation: "When the believers come to you, say to them—Peace be with you. Your Lord has bound Himself to Mercy; whoever sins in ignorance and then repents and turns toward God and reforms himself, God will forgive him and cover his sins." "Say to my transgressing creatures, Do not lose hope in God's Mercy, God will forgive all sins," (Quran). The prophet of God says: Do you see how a woman gives suck to her baby; yet your Lord is more merciful than she, and His mercy will be a hundredfold on the day of judgment.—TIMUR.

